UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/554,119	10/18/2006	Ole-Bendt Rasmussen	50000-OR04	4648	
	7590 09/30/201 FROZIER, P.L.L.C	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 429		LOPEZ, RICARDO E.			
BELLAIRE, TX	X //402-0429		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1786		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/30/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/554,119	RASMUSSEN, OLE-BENDT		
Examiner	Art Unit		
RICARDO E. LOPEZ	1786		

	RIC	CARDO E. LOPEZ	1786	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess
THE RE	PLY FILED <u>21 September 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. ⊠ Tr ap ap fo	ne reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the oplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (or Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR periods:	same day as filing a Notice of A es: (1) an amendment, affidavit with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aban ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
	The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of the	ory Action, or (2) the date set forth i than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejectio	n.
have bee under 37 set forth may redu	ns of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on wen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension of the shorter of th	on and the corresponding amount c ened statutory period for reply origit	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. Th fili No	ne Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliant ing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension of the Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within MENTS.	n thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🔯 T (a (b	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but p They raise new issues that would require further consider They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); They are not deemed to place the application in better for	eration and/or search (see NOT	E below);	
(d	appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a corre NOTE: <u>The proposed amendments would require furtled</u> 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			<u>18</u> . (See
5. A 6. N	the amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Supplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed.	·		·
7. X F ho Th Cl Cl Cl	on-allowable claim(s). or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) we will be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: laim(s) allowed: laim(s) objected to: laim(s) rejected: 49-66,96 and 97. laim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-48 and 67-95.		be entered and an ex	planation of
8. 🔲 Th	NIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before a specificant failed to provide a showing of good and suffaces as not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
er sh 10. 🔲 ٦	ne affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Nontered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overdowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of	come <u>all</u> rejections under appea d was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	to provide a
11. 🔯 1 12. 🔲 N	ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER The request for reconsideration has been considered but doe See Continuation Sheet. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO Other:		condition for allowand	ce because:
/REL/		/Jennifer A Chriss/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1786	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Remarks filed on September 21, 2010 have been carefully considered. Regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 49 - 66, these have been considered but are not persuasive for the following reasons.

Applicant traverses the rejection on the basis that Momose does not teach a film comprising an alloy having fibrils of a first polymer dispersed in a second polymer, where the fibrils have a thicknesses less than or equal to about 1 µm and a width at least 5 times the thickness.

In response to arguments, the Examiner respectfully directs Applicant's attention to the disclosure of Momose in Col. 3, lines 3 - 11, Each of the tapes 3 generally has a width of $75 \mu m$ or more. The thickness of the tapes 3 is preferably in the range of 0.05 to $10 \mu m$, more preferably 0.1 to $5 \mu m$. Therefore, the tapes or fibrils taught by Momose anticipate both dimensional limitations for Applicant's fibrils in the instant claims. Furthermore, the combinations Momose Gash and Momose Desarzens render obvious all other limitations in this application as set forth above in the 103 rejection of claims 49 - 55 and 96 - 97; and 60 - 66 respectively.